

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SHAVOTNAE GOLDSBY,

No. C-07-5604 MMC

Plaintiff,

**ORDER REFERRING IN PART AND
DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFF'S
OBJECTIONS**

v.

ADECCO, INC.,

Defendant

Before the Court are plaintiff's "Objections to Magistrate Judge Spero's August 5, 2008 Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff's Motion to Compel," filed August 15, 2008. Defendant has filed a response thereto. Having read and considered the parties' submissions, the Court rules as follows:

1. Plaintiff objects to the denial of her request to compel defendant to provide telephone numbers of putative class members. Such objection is hereby DENIED, for the reason plaintiff fails to make any showing of her entitlement to such information.¹

2. Plaintiff also objects to the restriction on her counsel's ability to contact the putative class members whose names and addresses are provided to plaintiff under the

¹Indeed, plaintiff has not shown she is entitled to the addresses of the putative class members in the absence of the putative class members' having been provided an opportunity to object to the disclosure of such private information. See Belaire-West Landscape, Inc. v. Superior Court, 149 Cal. App. 4th 554, 557, 561 (2007).

1 terms of the order. Although an order imposing restrictions may be appropriate, such order
2 must be supported by “specific findings that reflect a weighing of the need for a limitation
3 and the potential interference with the rights of the parties.” See Gulf Oil Co. v. Bernard,
4 452 U.S. 89, 101-02 (1981). Because the August 5, 2008 order does not expressly include
5 such findings, the matter is hereby REFERRED to the Magistrate Judge for the purpose of
6 providing such reasons or otherwise amending the order as the Magistrate Judge deems
7 appropriate.²

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9
10 Dated: August 29, 2008


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

²The Magistrate Judge also may wish to consider any effect Brinker Restaurant
28 Corp. v. Superior Court, 165 Cal. App. 4th 25 (2008), which case was decided subsequent
to the filing of plaintiff's motion to compel, may have on the issue.